



The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 30

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

**Ex parte** TIMOTHY P O'HAGAN

Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, FLEMING, and BARRY, **Administrative Patent Judges**.

FLEMING, **Administrative Patent Judge**.

**DECISION ON APPEAL**

This is a decision on appeal from the final rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-18, 20 and 22, all the claims pending in the instant application. Claims 3, 6, 7, 19 and 21 have been canceled.

**Invention**

The invention relates to a speech recognition system. See page 1 of Appellant's specification. Many conventional speech decoding systems utilize a phonetic encoder to convert the digital signals representing the utterance into a sequence of phoneme codes. Each phoneme is the smallest unit of speech that

can be used to distinguish one sound from another. The sequence of phoneme codes is decoded into a literal string of words using a phonetic dictionary and a syntax file. See page 1 of Appellant's specification. These conventional systems are not suitable for use in communication systems using mobile communication units. See page 3 of Appellant's specification. Appellant's speech recognition system performs speech decoding at the mobile terminal as compared to a host computer. Appellant's system utilizes a mobile terminal employing virtual Graphical User Interface (GUI) pages to facilitate user interface. Associated with each GUI file is a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) file, dictionary file which includes corresponding speech recognition identifying data (e.g., phoneme files) and a syntax file. The dictionary files and syntax files are limited in scope to provide for identification of commands associated primarily only with the particular GUI file. This greatly reduces the memory requirements because the dictionary file(s) and syntax file(s) are limited to words associated with the limited commands and data which the user of the mobile terminal could validly input in connection with a particular GUI file. See page 4 of Appellant's specification.

Independent claim 1 present in the application is representative of Appellant's claimed invention and is reproduced as follows:

1. A speech recognition system, comprising:

a host computer, the host computer operative to communicate at least one graphical user interface (GUI) display file to a mobile terminal, the GUI display file having attached thereto at least one of a dictionary file having phonemes and syntax file having allowable patterns of words to facilitate speech recognition, wherein the at least one of a dictionary file and syntax file are content specific to the GUI display file;

the mobile terminal including a microphone for receiving speech input; and

wherein the mobile terminal employs the at least one of a dictionary file and syntax file to facilitate speech recognition in connection with the at least one GUI display file.

#### **Reference**

The reference relied on by the Examiner is as follows:

Barclay et al. (Barclay)	5,960,399	Sep. 28, 1999
		(filed Dec. 24, 1997)

#### **Rejections at Issue**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-18, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barclay.

Throughout our opinion, we will make reference to the briefs<sup>1</sup> and the answer for the respective details thereof.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant filed an appeal brief on December 17, 2002.  
(continued...)

**OPINION**

With full consideration being given to the subject matter on appeal, the Examiner's rejections and the arguments of Appellant and Examiner, for the reasons stated *infra*, we reverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-18, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 14687, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Examiner can satisfy this burden by showing that some objective teaching in the prior art or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art suggests the claimed subject matter. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Only if this initial burden is met does the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shift to the Appellants.

---

<sup>1</sup>(...continued)  
Appellant filed a reply brief on May 15, 2003. The Examiner mailed out an Office communication on June 13, 2003 stating that the reply has been entered into the record.

Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

**Oetiker**, 977 F.2d at 1445, 24 USPQ2d at 1444. **See also Piasecki**, 745 F.2d at 1472, 223 USPQ at 788.

An obviousness analysis commences with a review and consideration of all the pertinent evidence and arguments. "In reviewing the [E]xaminer's decision on appeal, the Board must necessarily weigh all of the evidence and argument." **In re Oetiker**, 977 F.2d at 1445, 24 USPQ2d at 1444. "[T]he Board must not only assure that the requisite findings are made, based on evidence of record, but must also explain the reasoning by which the findings are deemed to support the agency's conclusion." **In re Lee**, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434 (Fed. Cir. 2002). With these principles in mind, we commence review of the pertinent evidence and arguments of Appellant and Examiner.

Appellant argues that Barclay fails to teach or suggest communicating a dictionary file having phonemes and a syntax file having an allowable pattern of words from a host computer to a mobile device, as required by Appellant's independent claims 1, 12, 18, 20 and 22. See pages 3-5 of Appellant's brief and reply brief.

The Examiner agrees that Barclay does not teach a host computer operative to communicating at least one graphical user

interface (GUI) display file to a mobile terminal, the GUI display file having attached thereto at least one of a dictionary file having phonemes and syntax file having allowable patterns of words to facilitate speech recognition, wherein the at least one of the dictionary files or syntax files are content specific to the GUI display file as recited in Appellant's claims. However, the Examiner points out that Barclay teaches in column 3, lines 16-17, that it is known to download grammar files to a mobile unit. The Examiner argues that one of ordinary skill in the art reading Barclay would recognize that the Appellant's invention would be considered prior art having limited vocabularies and grammars which are downloaded, based on specific Web page topics. See pages 3-4 of the Examiner's answer.

When determining obviousness, "[t]he factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching." **In re Lee**, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002), **citing McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.**, 262 F.3d 1339, 1351-52, 60 USPQ2d 1001, 1008 (Fed. Cir. 2001). "It must be based on objective evidence of record." **Id.** "Board conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not 'evidence.'" **In re Dembiczak**, 175 F.3d 994, 999,

Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617. "Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact." **Dembiczak**, 175 F.3d at 999, 50 USPQ2d at 1617, **citing McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co.**, 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Federal Circuit reviews the Board's ultimate conclusion of obviousness without deference, and the Board's underlying factual determinations for substantial evidence. **In re Huston**, 308 F.3d 1267, 1276, 64 USPQ2d 1801, 1806 (Fed. Cir. 2002) **citing In re Gartside**, 203 F.3d 1305, 1316, 53 USPQ2d 1769, 1776 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "The Board's findings must extend to all material facts and must be documented on the record, lest the 'haze of so-called expertise' acquire insulation from accountability." **In re Lee**, 277 F.3d 1338, 1345, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1435 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Upon our review of Barclay, we fail to find any suggestion or teaching of having a host computer operative to communicate at least one graphical user interface (GUI) display file to a mobile terminal, the GUI display file having attached thereto at least one of a dictionary file having phonemes and syntax file having allowable patterns of words to facilitate speech recognition, wherein the at least one of a dictionary file and syntax file are

Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

content specific to the GUI display file. We agree that Barclay teaches in column 3, lines 9-23, that prior art systems have downloaded grammar from a Web page. However, Barclay teaches in column 3, lines 7-8, that speech recognizer software is not to be downloaded. Thus, we find nothing in the Barclay teachings that suggests communicating phonemes from a host computer to a mobile terminal. In addition, we find that Barclay discusses the problem with downloading vocabulary and grammar associated system at runtime due to the large file sizes. Therefore, we fail to find anything within these teachings that would have suggested to one skilled in the art to modify the Barclay system so as to communicate a graphical user interface (GUI) display file to a mobile terminal, the GUI display file having attached thereto at least one of a dictionary file having phonemes and syntax file having allowable patterns of words to facilitate speech recognition as recited in Appellant's claims.



Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

In view of the foregoing, we have not sustained the  
Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-18, 20 and 22 under  
35 U.S.C. § 103.

**REVERSED**

JAMES D. THOMAS	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
MICHAEL R. FLEMING	)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge	)	AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
	)	
LANCE LEONARD BARRY	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

MRF/lbg

Appeal No. 2003-2018  
Application No. 09/057,261

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENT  
24TH FLOOR  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114